

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above identified application in view of the preceding amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-12, 15 and 16 without prejudice and amended Claims 17-22. New Claims 23-31 have been added by this amendment. The claim amendments were made to more precisely define the invention in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 2. These amendments have not been necessitated by the need to distinguish the present invention from any prior art. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by these amendments, as support therefor is found throughout the specification and drawings.

The Specification

The specification was objected to because of certain informalities. In this regard, the specification is hereby amended. Thus, the objection is believed no longer proper and an action acknowledging the same is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. §1.112

Claims 1-12 and 15-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for having certain informalities. The informalities have been addressed by the claim cancellations, amendments and additions herein and therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-12, 15 and 16

Claims 1-12, 15 and 16 have been canceled to obviate all rejections thereto and thus, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. §1.102 and §1.103

In the Office Action, various claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over WO 94/19505 (WO ‘505), U.S. Patent No. 4,070,398 to Lu, GB 2141360A (GB ‘360), and EP 367318 A (EP ‘318).

In the Office Action, various claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,173,652 to Taylor, U.S. Patent No. 5,061,478 to Yarkony, and GB ‘360 in various combinations.

Although all the rejected independent claims have been canceled to obviate the rejections, the references will be addressed with respect to the new claims.

WO ‘505 discloses lead for various purposes that might include roofing materials. The lead substrate would have a complex coating such as a vinyl polymer-based film. In another embodiment, the coating may be a plurality of differing polymers and a binder resin.

Lu is of special interest to those in the field of packaging, particularly for thick 0.8 to 2 mil foils with 0.1 to 5 mil complex lamination used for high technology packing light sensitive materials. One of ordinary skill in the art of roofing products would not be aware of or look to such a far removed and different technology area.

Taylor is another reference that is outside the common knowledge of those in the field of producing or handling lead sheet roofing products. Taylor discloses the use of PTFE. With regard to the selection of UV curing and curable resins, the Examiner asserts that Taylor discloses such throughout the entire document. It is respectfully submitted that this is a bare assertion without support in Taylor. In

particular, Taylor does not disclose the selection of resins (acrylic, and epoxy), use thereof in combination, and cold curing using UV.

Yarkony describes sprayable tacky polymer (i.e., not a cured film) that is essential in its tackiness to achieve its purpose of persistence at the applied locus. Yarkony is not properly combined with any of the references that deal with cured polymer coatings because such a combination would destroy the objectives of the references. For at least this reason, the rejections using Yarkony in combination are not proper and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

GB '360 only suggests the use of coatings including lubricant materials upon an adhesive for limiting toxic effects of shot (e.g., game pellets).

In contrast, Claim 23 recites a method of providing a pliable, malleable sheet roofing material based on a lead layer including the steps of applying to the lead layer a UV-polymerizable mixture comprising a photoinitiator, at least one acrylic based polymer and at least one epoxy based polymer, to form a coating in the range of from 2 to 300 microns thickness, and exposing the coating to UV light to cure same and form a solid film that prevents leaching of lead from the sheet, and remains resiliently deformable to allow the sheet roofing material to be worked and formed into a required shape without the coating cracking or flaking away from the lead layer. Thus, a leach-preventative flexible polymer sealant solid film is formed upon a lead sheet. None of the cited references teach or suggest, alone or in part, in whole or in combination such a method of making UV curable acrylic/epoxy combination resins. As a result of the method, the acrylic component introduces a toughening effect to the epoxy which provides good adhesion, which provides a uniquely beneficial flexible coating upon the lead layer to allow the lead

layer to retain its physical properties yet loses the disadvantages of leaching and toxicity in handling. Similarly, none of the reference suggest the struture of the product as recited in Claim 31. Accordingly, Claims 23, 31 and each of the claims depending therefrom distinguish the subject invention from the cited references. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Additionally, regarding the combinations proposed by the Examiner, it is far beyond the skill of the ordinary artisan to bring together expertise from the diverse arts of gun munitions and building construction. The newly presented independent claims do not broadly read on such a large area of expertise, thus the proposed combinations are not proper for at least the reason that these references would not be within the skill of one in the art to combine. An action acknowledging the same is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now remaining in this application are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. Any additional fees or overpayments due as a result of filing the present paper may be applied to Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

If after reviewing this amendment, the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would facilitate the resolution of any remaining matters the undersigned attorney may be contacted at the number set forth herein below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 15, 2009

Electronic signature: /George N. Chaclas/
George N. Chaclas, Reg. No. 46,608
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP
Attorney for Applicants
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
Tel: (401) 276-6653
Fax: (888) 325-1684
Email: gchaclas@eapdlaw.com